

JAN 2 3 197

02-277

From Sent Simon Noel [snoel@lonestar utsa edu]

Federal Communications Con Office of the Section

То:

Wednesday, December 31, 2003 2 52 AM

Michael Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

Cc: fcc@thetip org

Dear FCC Commissioners:

That the te

Please don't allow companies to own more than one television station in the same market. The media is centralized enough as it is

Best,

Simon Noel

If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please notify the sender immediately. The contents of this e-mail do not amend any existing disclosures or agreements unless expressly stated.

Branch Connect I

From:

democraticmedia@democraticmedia.org

Sent:

Monday, January 12, 2004 12:01 AM

To:

Michael Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

Subject: Stop the digital broadcast give-away

Crivilly.

From Sabrina Choi

AN 2 3 2604

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media new relation. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

+ 1 L

RECEIVED 62.277

MARKETTON FOR THE

Stephanie Kost

JAN 2 3 2004

From:

Ron Kellner [rkellner@abraxis.com]

Federal Communications Communication

Sent: To:

Thursday, January 08, 2004 10:07 AM

Office of the Sucretary

Commissioner Adelstein, kimweb@fcc gov; Michael Copps; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael

Powell

Subject:

Relaxing broadcasting ownership rules

Honorable Michael Powell Honorable Kathleen Abernathy Honorable Michael Copps Honorable Kevin Martin Honorable Jonathan Adelstein

Please do not relax the broadcasting ownership rules as the broadcasting media already controls what is communicated to the public and it is already biased. The independent voices will no longer be heard. We will become a dictatorial country by the media that will be controlled by large media corporations.

The media has been using their power to only communicate their views and keep opposing views out of the news. The approval of relaxing the ownership rules will not allow the individual or opposing view on the air.

Please do your duty and protect the individual citizen rights of free speech and Disapprove the request to relax the ownership rules.

We now only listen to local stations as they are the only ones who give you both sides of the story

Respectfully, Ronald K Kellner 5033 Highland Ridge Run Gamesville, GA 30506

to ar Caglan mold

From:

democraticmedia@democraticmedia org

Sent:

Sunday, January 11, 2004 4:25 PM

To: Subject: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps; KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

Stop the digital broadcast give-away

ne Elved

From: Margaret Iovino

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media samewhip. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

Congress must RESTORE public interest responsibility to the broadcast media, or give us back their licenses and their airwaves!! These belong to us!!

Harry Commence

02-277

Stephanie Kost

From:

democraticmedia@democraticmedia org

Sent: To: Saturday, January 10, 2004 11 11 AM

Subject:

Michael Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

Stop the digital broadcast give-away

FillerVID

From Margaret Sullivan

JAN 2 3 2014

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of the factor viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

The FCC must not proceed to give away the obligations of the public interest for digital broadcasting. I want more access to a wider range of news and public interest broadcasting. No more hand-outs for the broadcasting lobby. These are the citizen's airways!

1777 004 1

HE.

JAN 2

02-217

Stephanie Kost

Federal Communicat

From Sent:

democraticmedia@democraticmedia org

Office of the Sc.

To:

Wednesday, December 31, 2003 9 31 AM

Subject:

From: Jeffrey Hall

Michael Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KJMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein

RECEIVED

Stop the digital broadcast give-away

JAN 2 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect divers the of the Geridary ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates

What is currently offered on both the network and cable channels is almost without exception a complete waste of time for any person with an IQ above that of bread mold. Without programming designed to engage and inform the public we as a naion collectively continue to devolve into a lower form of intelligence.

the office of the

1

From:

democraticmedia@democraticmedia.org

Sent:

Monday, January 12, 2004 2:17 PM

To:

Michael Powell, Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps, KJMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein

1 16-116-118-1-7

Subject: Stop the digital broadcast give-away

From paula erker

IAN 23 /000

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media company these rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of $a_{\rm cl}$ viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

A democracy by definition cannot be made up of one party. Today, mass media is presenting only one side of the current political climate to the general public. The FCC, as federal agency, should be concerned with maintaining "fair and balanced" representation by the mass media

From:

democraticmedia@democraticmedia.org

Sent:

Monday, January 12, 2004 11:41 PM

To: Subject: Michael Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps; KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

Stop the digital broadcast give-away

From Christopher Isensee

JAN 2 3 2004

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of media viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media. Conglomerates.

I am sick of the way the big corporations that now control the great majority of the news media, particularly television control the way we think. This defeats the way our democratic system should work

some mand

Calvin Howell

From:

grea@comcast net

Sent:

Wednesday, December 10, 2003 2 29 PM

To: Subject: Michael Copps Media accessibility

Dear Sir,

rederation minum, and I conceive as a lack of quality in the with the current rules on media ownership we as a nation are being fed a reduced version of news. For the last year I have been getting more news from companies outside of the United States Now, I look at US news stations and wonder why they are not covering some of the We used to be the leader in journalism Now it seems corporate interests are more important than society issues. The owners are using the news to promote their political or ideological views. Instead of getting an overall view of an issue we are getting a slanted one-sided view. Fox is the best example of this. Their corporate influence is obviously pushing an ultraconservative agenda. What happened to objectivity? This is causing a love it or leave it atmosphere.

Rupert Murdoch is now trying to purchase DirecTV. This will further reduce the variety of options for Americans. Through satellite TV we can get more of a variety then from other I fear that this move will allow corporate interests to now determine what stations are available to us. We need to move more towards diversity and less towards one-size-fits-all The more one individual can control the less competition and variety available Whether you are conservative, liberal or something in between we should not be subjected to just one side of an issue

Greg Rea 1135 5th Ave. New Brighton, PA 15066

as were

From:

democraticmedia@democraticmedia org

Sent:

Wednesday, January 07, 2004 5:45 PM

To:

Michael Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps; K. Commissioner Adelstein

Subject: Stop the digital broadcast give-away

JAN 2 3 ±004

From: Patricia Hval

ederal Communications Commission Office of the Sucretary

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

response and L

From:

Stevo [solarzeropoint@hotmail.com] Saturday, January 03, 2004 3 02 AM

Sent: Saturday, Janua To: Michael Powell

Subject: Clear Channel Communications is WRONG

JAN 2 3 2004

nederal Cosmouth in this first inscion Office of the Secretary

Clear Channel kills creativity and choice because they own a majority of the radio stations in Los Angeles. Because Clear Channel is so large (they own 1,200 radio stations across the U.S.), they control what is broadcasted on 102.7 KIIS, KOST, STAR, KBIG, KFI AM, 92.3 HOT, KLAC AM, KGGI and KXTA AM. Clear Channel's large size allows them to "lease" out competitors such as KDL since there are no antitrust laws that prevent them from killing the competition

endone was L

RECEIVED 02-217

From:

Jack & Betty Jo [grandbjo@mind.net]

Sent:

Monday, January 05, 2004 4 05 PM Michael Copps

To:

JAN 2 3 ZIEJA нефега.√ i Pj. i J J E. 1867

count us in for stronger local ownership and programming....we do not appreciate having out of area stations interrupting our local public radio station.

thank you,

Betty Jo & Jack Reynolds

THE WASHINGTON

my the way I

RECEIVED 02-27

Stephanie Kost

From:

democraticmedia@democraticmedia.org

Sent:

To:

Friday, January 02, 2004 9:30 PM

Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Commissioner, AdelStein

·;;;

Subject:

Stop the digital broadcast give-away

From Steve Rusk

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates

3

TO CHALLED FOR FOR

From: Sent: edward lipman [njvet01@yahoo com] Thursday, January 08, 2004 2 14 PM

To: Cc:

Michael Powell Ed Lipman

Subject:

Re Station ownership

DECEIVED

TAN 2 3 2004

Jederal of Unicommissions Commission Office of the Secretary

Mr Michael Powell

Dear Sir

I would like to say that I am not in agreement with the recent ruling allowing more TV stations to be owned by fewer companies.

Here in Charleston SC I have seen the result of this, because one station has an agreement with another to produce news programming. This means that I can get the same news on both channels, in effect only giving me one viewpoint instead of two

The same can also be said for radio stations that have the same ownership. I listen to Rock and Roll oldies stations and I now understand one company owns about 60% of the stations broadcasting that type of programming

Since I am now 61 years old I am nostalgic for the type of shows broadcast in the 50 s and 60 s, but I also realize you can't go back, I think radio programming is too packaged and not spontaneous.

i still think it was a mistake to rule this way and think the ruling should go the other way, because the airwaves are for the public interest more than for corporate profit

Thank You for your time Edward Lipman

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Hotjobs: Enter the "Signing Bonus" Sweepstakes

No of Castle fold !

From: Sent:

El Hefe [mrntx@yahoo.com]

To:

Saturday, January 03, 2004 3 23 PM

Michael Powell

Subject: deregulation matters JAN 2 3 7904



The Text of the section of the secti

mr. chairman,

please do not loosen restrictions on media-ownership, do you realize of effects of what will happen? apparently not, you cannot conceive the negative impact it will have on opinion, and how ultimately it will hurt the news channels themselves, who will trust them? not I, but that still believe the american system could never go wrong and blindly follow the news will be mislead in every conceivable way. mostly, the 55+ community and the under 21 crowd, the elders will trust because they always have. they feel there is a sense of duty to trust what the news presents although virtually every major study on news bias has concluded that each of the major networks (seen by old people) is extremely bias in one direction or the other, and the younger crowd under 21 just doesn't know jack to start with. they are so easy to hit with propaganda, except as it relates to motivation, they care about very little that does not have a direct impact on themselves, and so hall fination will grow up to blindly trust the news, whilst the other half will fiercely protest the news and how it is presented and great lines will be drawn between them and they will become another great factor of partisanship and elections.

you need to justify yourself.

write me a response. I deserve it, i'm just one person, write me and explain how your new policy will POSITIVELY impact the way news is presented, and don't leave judgment up to the public and say ridiculous claims like it doesn't matter how it is presented, americans will believe what they want to believe, etc. americans are not what you call objective.

sincerely, mike rogers, texas

Do you Yahoo!?

Protect your identity with Yahoo! Mail AddressGuard

02-277

Stephanie Kost

TAN DANGER OF THE

From.

democraticmedia@democraticmedia org

Sent:

Wednesday, December 24, 2003 2 55 PM

To: Subject: Michael Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Comps KIMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

Stop the digital broadcast give-away

JAN 2 3 7004

From b Ferrero

Federal Communication: 1 00 04 Office on the 100 office of the 100 office office of the 100 office office office office office office offi

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

Something in this wonderful (so far) country needs to be done with the public's interest in mind. Let's have some TRUE reality

the new years of the second